

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/097,023	06/12/1998	JILL MCFADDEN	290252021800	2472	
28075	7590 04/02/2004		EXAM	INER	
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE			HAYES, M	HAYES, MICHAEL J	
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			3763		

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/097,023	MCFADDEN ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael J Hayes	3763
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) X they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \boxtimes The drawing correction filed on <u>05 March 2004</u> is a	a)□ approved or b)⊠ disappro	oved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	.
10. Other:		MAHayer
	·	Michael J Hayes Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3763

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's proposed amendment to claim 24 raises new issues that require further consideration and/or search. Applicant's proposed amendment to claim 5 raises the issue of new matter. Applicant should point out where there is support in the application, as filed, for a coil and braid alongside each other between the liner and cover. The rejections of record are maintained.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the prior art discloses a knitted layer as discussed in the reference. Applicant's reliance on the figures for specific details is misplaced. The reference clearly states the layer is knitted. A knitted layer is generally not radially expandable because the loops do not allow the knit free expansion. Applicant switches between generally not radially expandable and non-radially expandable in his arguments (see page 11). Applicant should clearly state whether there is some expansion of the knit layer. Applicant argues that Leoni fails to disclose a knit tubular member that is generally not radially expandable. The examiner maintains that the knit member disclosed by Leoni is generally not expandable. Applicant's arguments that other parts of the Leoni invention are also not expandable are not convincing to change the current rejections. Applicant's arguments that Leoni does not show a knitted member providing strength and flexibility because Leoni shows a member that prevents overexpansion is not convincing. In preventing overexpansion the member provides strength and flexibility.